

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

8
9 United States of America,
10 Plaintiff,
11 v.
12 Grady Blackwell,
13 Defendant.

14 No. CR-13-01462-PHX-MTL

ORDER

15 Before the Court is Defendant Grady Blackwell's Motion for Early Termination of
16 Supervised Release. (Docs. 340, 341.) The Government has filed a Response. (Doc. 343.)
17 For the following reasons, the motion is denied.¹

18 I.

19 On March 9, 2015, United States District Judge Neil V. Wake sentenced Defendant
20 to five years of imprisonment (with credit for time served) for his involvement in a cross-
21 country marihuana shipping case. (Doc. 268.) Defendant was also placed on four years of
22 supervised release. (*Id.*) According to the U.S. Bureau of Prison's website, Defendant was
23 released on March 22, 2017. *See Find an Inmate*, Federal Bureau of Prisons,
24 <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/> (last visited Dec. 7, 2020). (*See also* Doc. 338 ¶ 2.) By the
25 Court's calculation, Defendant's supervised release is set to expire in less than four months,
26 on March 22, 2021.

27
28

¹ Neither party has requested oral argument. Both parties have submitted legal memoranda
and oral argument would not have aided the Court's decisional process. *See Partridge v.*
Reich, 141 F.3d 920, 926 (9th Cir. 1998).

Defendant filed the instant motion on October 26, 2020.² (Docs. 340, 341.) The Government filed a response in opposition. (Doc. 343.) Defendant has not timely filed a reply.

II.

A district court has broad discretion to impose terms of supervised release. *United States v. Emmett*, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014); 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). This includes the discretion to terminate such release after a defendant has served one year of supervised release. *Id.* In deciding whether to terminate supervision, the courts must review sentencing factors including:

(1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; (2) deterrence; (3) protection of the public; (4) the need to provide the defendant with educational, vocational training, medical care or other rehabilitation; (5) the sentence and sentencing range established for the category of defendant; (6) any pertinent policy statement by the Sentencing Commission; (7) the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and (8) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7).

United States v. Smith, 219 Fed. Appx. 666, 667 n.3 (9th Cir. 2007). A district court need “not give an elaborate explanation of its reasons for accepting or rejecting” a defendant’s arguments with respect to supervised release, and it “need not tick off each of the [relevant] § 3553(a) factors to show that it has considered them.” *United States v. Emmett*, 749 F.3d 817, 821–22 (9th Cir. 2014) (citation omitted).

III.

Defendant moves for the early termination of his supervised release. He offers various arguments in support of his motion, including that he has been employed since his release from custody, "has maintained a stable residence in a safe and low-crime

² Defendant also filed a motion for early termination of supervised release on September 19, 2019 (Doc. 337), which the Court denied. (Doc. 339.)

1 environment for his family and himself,” has “remarkable ties with his family,” “timely
2 pays his taxes,” and has successfully complied with the terms of his supervised release.³
3 (Doc. 340 at 1-2.) The Court agrees and acknowledges that these facts are commendable.

4 Nonetheless, the Court is also mindful of the Government’s argument that due to an
5 extensive criminal history of approximately 20 prior convictions, Defendant’s initial
6 sentencing range was 188–235 months. Due to his advanced age and other factors, the
7 Government and Defendant ultimately stipulated that his sentence would not exceed 60
8 months (Doc. 189), which the Court accepted. (Doc. 268.) The Court agrees that, in light
9 of the “benefits” that Defendant has already received in this case, as well as the limited
10 time remaining on supervised release, it is appropriate for Defendant to complete his full
11 term of supervised release. (Doc. 343 at 2.) Upon consideration of these facts, the relevant
12 sentencing factors, and the parties’ briefing, the Court will deny Defendant’s motion.

13 **IV.**

14 Accordingly,

15 **IT IS ORDERED** denying Defendant’s Motion for Early Termination of
16 Supervised Release. (Docs. 340, 341.)

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** directing the U.S. Probation Office to send a copy
18 of this Order to Defendant’s last known mailing address.

19 Dated this 7th day of December, 2020.

20
21 
22

23 Michael T. Liburdi
24 United States District Judge
25

26 ³ Defendant also asserts that he “has spoken with his Probation Officer, Ms. Richardson,
27 and . . . she will not object if the Court deems the early termination of his supervised release
28 appropriate based on Movant’s post-release conduct.” (Doc. 340 at 2.) As the Government
notes, this position is not otherwise reflected on the record in this case. (Doc. 343 at 2.)
Even if it were, for the reasons that follow, it would not affect the Court’s ruling on this
matter.